



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,361	06/13/2001	Joseph H. Hoffman	EKM-80279	8740

7590 04/25/2002

James R. Brueggemann, Esquire
Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton LLP
48th Floor
333 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071

EXAMINER

BLAU, STEPHEN LUTHER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3711

DATE MAILED: 04/25/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,361

Applicant(s)

HOFFMAN ET AL.

Examiner

Stephen L. Blau

Art Unit

3711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar (4,220,336) and WO 00/62873.

JP 9-248355 discloses a hosel plug being cylindrical in the form of fitting in a hole which has a diameter, a shaft secured to the hosel cavity at a location above the hosel plug, a plurality of plugs each having the same size and shape but different weights, and plug weights in the range of (.5-3) grams (Solution).

JP 9-248355 lacks a plug having a metallic powder, a compliant polymeric material compression fitted into the hosel cavity, and different plug weights based on the amount of powder mixed into the plug material. Kochevar discloses a weight slug placed inside a shaft formed of a deformable binder, a powdered metal (Col. 5, Lns. 36-50), and varying the proportions of the materials to achieve desired results (Col. 5, Lns. 67 through Col. 6, Ln. 2). WO 00/62873 discloses a deformable insert being placed inside a shaft being a polymer material (Page 8 Lns. 14-15) and compression fitting into a shaft (Page 12 Lns. 9-11). In view of the patent of Kochevar it would have been

Art Unit: 3711

obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a plug being a deformable binder with a metal powder in order to simplify the assembly process by deforming the shape to fit a cavity instead of requiring more precise dimensions to ensure proper fitting. In addition, in view of the patent of Kochevar it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have different plug weights based on the amount of powder mixed into the plug material in order to provide a variety of weights from which a golfer would choose from to adjust a clubs swing weight. In view of the document WO 00/62873 it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a binder being a compliant polymeric material in order to have a plug which returns to the original form when a stress is removed so that the plug is more easily handled and stored without deteriorating.

3. Claims 2 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar (4,220,336) and WO 00/62873 as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, and 15 above, and further in view of Yoneyama and Sasamoto.

JP 9-248355 lacks a metallic powder being tungsten, a polymeric material being nylon, and tungsten having a weight percentage in the range of 0-96 %. Kochevar discloses a metal lead metal powder added to a plug with a weight percentage of 90 % (Col. 5, Lns. 60-65). Yoneyama discloses a metallic powder added to a head weighting member being lead or tungsten (Col. 3, Lns. 28-40). In view of the patent of Kochevar and Yoneyama it would have been obvious to modify the plug of JP 9-248355 to have a metallic powder being tungsten in a weight percentage of 90 % and varied from that

amount to achieve different weighted plugs in order to add more weight for the same volume of powder added to a plug compared to lead. Sasamoto discloses a weighting member being made of a binder and metal powder with the binder being nylon (Col. 3, Lns. 58-68). In view of the patent of Sasamoto it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a polymeric material being nylon in order to utilize a polymeric material available in the market place and to utilize the characteristics of nylon.

4. Claims 5 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar (4,220,336) and WO 00/62873 as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, and 15 above, and further in view of Bingman.

JP 9-248355 lacks a hosel's lower cylindrical cavity having a diameter of about 8.5 mm and a length of 10 mm, a hosel's upper cylindrical cavity having a diameter of about 9 mm and a length of 25 mm. Bingman discloses a cylindrical cavity (32) for a shaft being 9 mm (Col. 4, Lns. 53-58) and an axial length of an upper section (36) of a cylindrical cavity being 10 millimeters (Col. 4, Lns. 49-54) with an additional hosel depth below the upper section (Ref. No. 32, Fig. 3). Clearly with that addition of the lower hosel bore (32) the total hosel length would be over 20 mm. An artisan skilled in the art of designing a hosel enough surface area to form a secure attachment to a shaft would have selected a suitable length bore for a hosel in which 25 millimeters is included. In addition, an artisan skilled in the art of forming a lower hole for a weight plug smaller in diameter than a hosel hole which fits a shaft would have selected a suitable diameter

Art Unit: 3711

and depth of a hole to prevent the shaft from entering and to add sufficient weight in which a hole of 8.5 mm in diameter and 10 mm in depth is included.

In view of the patent of Bingman it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a hosel's upper cylindrical cavity having a diameter of about 9 mm in order to fit a shaft having a tip diameter of 9 mm. In addition, it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a cavity length of 25 mm in order to have sufficient surface area to attach a tip end of a shaft to a head.

It would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a hosel's lower cylindrical cavity having a diameter of about 8.5 mm in order to prevent a shaft having a diameter of 9 mm from placing stress on a plug and to have a cavity length of 10 mm in order to have sufficient volume to add a sufficient amount of weight to a club to affect the swing weight.

5. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar (4,220,336) and WO 00/62873 as applied to claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, and 15 above, and further in view of Allen.

JP 9-248355 discloses a plug having a weight of .5-3.0 grams (Solution).

JP 9-248355 lacks a plug constituting (.25 -3.25) % of the heads total weight. Allen discloses a head total weight being in a range of 190-205 grams. In view of the patent of Allen it would have been obvious to modify the club of JP 9-248355 to have a total head weight of 190- 205 grams in order to transfer energy to a ball at impact. As such the plug would constitute (.25 -3.25) % of the heads total weight.

Art Unit: 3711


6. Claim 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar (4,220,336), WO 00/62873, Yoneyama, Sasamoto and Allen.

See paragraphs above for elements of structure previously rejected by JP 9-248355 in view of Kochevar, WO 00/62873, Yoneyama, Sasamoto and Allen.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Blau whose telephone number is (703) 308-2712. The examiner is available Monday through Friday from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.. If the examiner is unavailable you can contact his supervisor Paul Sewell whose telephone number is (703) 308-2126. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0858.

Slb 22 April 2002


STEPHEN BLAU
PRIMARY EXAMINER